1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO
3	
4	IN RE: SANTA FE NATURAL TOBACCO COMPANY MARKETING and SALES PRACTICES and PRODUCTS and
5	PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION
6	LEAD CASE NO. 1:16 MD 02695 JB/LF
7	
8	Transcript of Telephonic Status Conference
9	Proceedings before The Honorable James O. Browning, United States District Judge, Albuquerque, Bernalillo
10	County, New Mexico, commencing on October 21, 2020.
11	
12	
13	
14	Tanniffan Daar HADD DDD DMD GGD
15 16	Jennifer Bean, FAPR, RDR, RMR, CCR United States Court Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter
17	333 Lomas, Northwest Albuquerque, NM 87102
18	Phone: (505) 348-2283 Fax: (505) 843-9492
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	





1	THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon
2	everyone. I appreciate everybody making themselves
3	available to me this afternoon.
4	The Court will call In Re: Santa Fe Natural
5	Tobacco Company Marketing and Sales Practices and
6	Products Liability Litigation, Lead Case No. 1:16 MD
7	02695 JB/LF.
8	If the counsel will enter their appearances
9	for the plaintiffs.
10	MR. SCHLESINGER: Good afternoon, Judge.
11	I'll start out. Scott Schlesinger for the plaintiff.
12	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Schlesinger,
13	good afternoon to you.
14	Anybody else from the plaintiffs on the
15	phone that want to enter an appearance this
16	afternoon?
17	MS. WEINER: Hi, Judge, good afternoon.
18	Melissa Weiner, Pearson, Simon & Warshaw, on behalf
19	of the plaintiffs.
20	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Weiner, good
21	afternoon to you.
22	Anyone else? Sounds like somebody else?
23	MR. MATT SCHULTZ: Matt Schultz, Levin
24	Papantonio Firm on behalf of the plaintiffs, Your
25	Honor.



1	THE COURT: Give me that again. I didn't
2	quite catch you on that. Matt Schultz?
3	MR. MATT SCHULTZ: Yes, Your Honor. Matt
4	Schultz, Levin Papantonio.
5	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Schultz, good
6	afternoon to you.
7	Anyone else on the plaintiffs' side?
8	MS. LONG: Your Honor, Nancy Long on behalf
9	of the plaintiffs as well.
10	THE COURT: Ms. Long, good afternoon to
11	you.
12	Anyone else on the plaintiffs' side?
13	MR. GDANSKI: Good afternoon, Judge.
14	Jonathan Gdanski for the plaintiff.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Gdanski, good afternoon to
16	you.
17	Somebody else on the plaintiffs' side want
18	to enter an appearance?
19	MR. HABERMAN: (Unintelligible.)
20	THE COURT: Say that again.
21	MR. HABERMAN: (Unintelligible.)
22	THE COURT: All right. We're still not
23	picking you up. Do you want to spell your name for
24	the court reporter?
25	MR. HABERMAN: Sure. Jeffrey Haberman.







1	side?
2	MR. SCHULTZ: Your Honor, this is Andrew
3	Schultz from the Rodey Law Firm for the defendants.
4	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Schultz, good
5	afternoon to you.
6	Anyone else?
7	MS. REISMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor
8	this is Sharyl Reisman on behalf of the defendants.
9	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Reisman, good
L 0	afternoon to you.
L1	MR. BIERSTEKER: And Peter Biersteker, Your
L 2	Honor.
L 3	THE COURT: Say that one more time.
L 4	MR. BIERSTEKER: Sure. Peter Biersteker.
L 5	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Biersteker,
L 6	good afternoon to you.
L 7	Anybody else for the Reynolds Group?
L 8	MR. MONDE: That should be it for Reynolds,
L 9	Judge.
20	THE COURT: All right. Anybody else on the
21	phone that blipped in and wants to enter an
22	appearance?
23	All right. Well, let me give you two
24	thoughts. I'll certainly hear what anybody wants to
25	say, but these two thoughts may be helpful to you as



we discuss.

1

2 First of all, I get up every morning during 3 the pandemic and try to tell myself to do three 4 things during the day: One, be compassionate, 5 because I know everybody is approaching the pandemic in a different way; be flexible; and be compromising. 6 7 So I have learned over the last six months to probably do things that I never thought I'd have to 8 9 do or do or learn to do. And I'm not saying that I'm 10 great at everything. But we're all making 11 adjustments. Chances are, if you -- if the two sides here agree to do something, I will go along. 12 13 don't have to worry too much about pleasing the judge 14 because I'm trying to be flexible and compromising. 15 And if it works for you, it will probably work for 16 So if y'all are getting along, and y'all have 17 done a lot of things through this case and gotten 18 along, if y'all got along and, you're saying: is the way we want to do this hearing, and we'll work 19 20 together to get it done, and this is what we've compromised and come up with, chances are I'll go 21 22 along with it, too. 23

The second thing I wanted to mention is that as far as the Daubert hearings, here is sort of my rule on Daubert hearings, but again, I can be



24



1	talked into probably what you want. Generally, what
2	I do on Daubert hearings is if the proponent of the
3	expert wants to have that person here, that's fine.
4	I always am reluctant and maybe even hate to
5	exclude an expert of a party without giving the
6	proponent of that expert an opportunity to bring the
7	expert here or Zoom or however we do it, and have me
8	see and hear the direct examination,
9	cross-examination of that witness. But I don't
10	require it. So, you know, this is probably not a
11	case where people are, you know, short on money and
12	resources, but a lot of cases in New Mexico, you
13	know, it's hard for, particularly a plaintiff, to put
14	on an expert and pay for the expert to be here. So I
15	generally will defer to the proponent. If somebody
16	says, "Oh, Judge, you've got to have him here," and
17	it's the opponent, I'm a little more reluctant to
18	start forcing witnesses to be here. But I'll listen.
19	So largely, if you have worked things out, that's
20	fine, and I'm here, then, to probably resolve
21	disputes between you.
22	But as I looked over your two-page letter
23	to me, and then also reviewed the order extending the

24

25



deadlines that we filed back at the end of September,

those were two things that I thought I might be able

to say at the beginning that would maybe help us with our discussion this afternoon. But I don't know.

But why don't I start with calling on the plaintiffs. So Mr. Schlesinger, I'll call on you. And if somebody else has a different way of telling me what the issues are for today and what you need from me and what you want from me, let me know. But I'll start with you, Mr. Schlesinger.

MR. SCHLESINGER: May it please the Court. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Schlesinger.

MR. SCHLESINGER: The first thing I would say is I'd like to determine from the Court if, in fact, the hearing will be conducted by Zoom. I'm willing to do so. I'm pretty sure, if I recall my conversation with Mr. Monde, he's willing to do that as well. And that we would conduct these hearings on the 14th or the 18th; not live in person, but by a Zoom, and even with whatever witnesses we present, we present them as well by videoconferencing. If that's good with Your Honor, if that's Your Honor's preference that's good with us, and that would be our preference as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Monde, is that okay with

SANTA FE OFFICE 119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949 FAX (505) 843-9492

you?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



MR. MONDE: Judge, in a word it is. I had the opportunity to do a meet and confer with some of Mr. Schlesinger's colleagues yesterday. Obviously, first, we're going to do whatever the Court would like us to do. But given your opening comments, while we would all like to be present in Albuquerque in December, that does not seem feasible as we sit here.

And so the other point that we agreed on; that neither side wants anyone to be advantaged or disadvantaged by being present in the courtroom, some people, and other people by Zoom. So what we agreed is that it would be all or nothing. So that no one feels any pressure to appear live, when they don't really want to do that, or don't feel they can do that safely. So I would simply say that we concur in holding the hearings by Zoom from being out there. know that the courtroom is wired for that sort of thing and high tech. But on behalf of all the parties, I want to offer whatever assistance we can provide to the Court to facilitate a virtual hearing that runs smoothly.

THE COURT: Well, I think we have an agreement, we're going to do this by Zoom, and that's fine. Right at the moment -- your local counsel,



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



Ms. Long, Mr. Koluncich, and Mr. Schultz can probably tell you, right at the moment I don't think anybody wants to be in this state. So it's tricky getting in. It's tricky doing things. We're operating here. I had a sentencing yesterday where I had people in the courtroom. But I'm sitting here talking to Zoom a lot. That's fine. So unless y'all tell me otherwise, we'll plan on it being by Zoom.

Here are the things you may want to give some thought to. Mr. Gonzales is sitting right in front of me. You can work with him. If Mr. Gonzales says, Yep, he can handle it all, that's fine. We did have -- I did have a high profile case about two weeks ago where, put it kindly, I thought the clerks office let us down -- not Mr. Gonzales -- let us down, in that the public could not be present, and some people who were amicus in the case could not be So I've had experience with sort of a major breakdown of a Zoom call that did not allow either the public or amicus to be involved. Now, that's not probably what we're looking here, but I am disappointed in the performance of that. So Mr. Gonzales may say, Yep, he can handle it all. doesn't, then his superior is my old courtroom deputy, K'Aun Wild, who y'all may have started this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

case with and know her. She is quite available to 1 2 assist either Mr. Gonzales, y'all, whatever. 3 guess I would encourage you to maybe -- we're looking 4 at five days here. That's going to be -- we all are 5 probably getting a little weary of doing everything And five days is a lot. I've done a lot of 6 by Zoom. 7 But still, five days is going to be a stuff by Zoom. record for me as far as Zooming for five days. 8 9 that's fine. But y'all may want to try to interface 10 with Mr. Gonzales, Ms. Wild, and whoever they point 11 you to to make sure that when we start on Monday 12 morning, at 8:30 or whenever we're starting, we get 13 off to a good start and we don't have any problems. 14 So I'm not threatening, warning, or anything like that. It's just sort of -- it may make sense for 15 16 y'all to have some discussions with Mr. Gonzales 17 and/or Ms. Wild, and then whoever they point you to 18 in the building to make sure we get off to a good 19 strong start. 20 We'll do that, Judge. MR. MONDE: 21 THE COURT: Anything else on that subject? 22 Mr. Schlesinger? Mr. Monde? Or are we ready to go 23 to the next subject? 24 Only thing on that, MR. SCHLESINGER:

Judge, and it probably will come up again, is that

you've just given us a heads-up on the hours of the day that you'll be conducting the hearing, so we can plan to be on the call and off the call depending what time you start, what time you break, things like that.

THE COURT: Yeah, I know y'all are all scattered out. But largely, you're probably on the east coast, so I know these are going to be hard for you. But here's the problem I have, if I don't run it New Mexico time, the security in this building, my court reporter, Mr. Gonzales has a family, my clerks. It just gets hard for me to really run a courtroom with security and everything like that unless I keep sort of normal hours.

So here's what I would suggest, but I'm open to something different if y'all are. We start at 8:30; we work an hour and a half at a time, so that would put us about 10:00. We take our first break at 10:00, and then we pick back up at 10:15; we go to 11:45. And here's where I get flexible and y'all can do it either way. I think Ms. Bean will agree to do it this way. We take a 15-minute break, then we go another hour and a half; we take a late lunch New Mexico time. If that's too late for you, we take it at 11:45; we pick up back at 12:45, and we



go to -- what is that going to be, 1:15, 2:15; take a 1 2 break at 2:15; start again at 2:30. And that goes to 3 Take a 4:15 break, and we go to 5:30 New 4 Mexico time, call it a day. That's a lot of work, but that's what I would offer and propose, or 5 otherwise it gets difficult at this end to start 6 7 operating under maybe east coast time. What do you think about that, Mr. Schlesinger? 8 9 If it please the Court, I MR. SCHLESINGER: 10 think that I think we've all anticipated that we 11 would work on New Mexico time. I have, even though 12 I'll be on the east coast. I'm working on your time, 13 Judge, your courtroom, your time. I'm fine to start 14 at 8:30. And I'm also fine with taking a short break at 11:45 for 15 minutes, and working for another hour 15 16 and a half. I'm fine with doing that. But I'm 17 not -- I think that's a great idea. So, if Your 18 Honor wants to do that, and if Mr. Monde is good 19 with, that I'm good with it. THE COURT: It doesn't matter. 20 It's going to be a little late lunch for y'all. And if you'd 21 22 prefer to take it -- Ms. Bean doesn't care, I don't 23 think -- she doesn't care. So it's kind of y'all's

24

25



call. And you don't have to decide it today.

have any preference, Mr. Monde?

The schedule you outlined is 1 MR. MONDE: 2 fine here, Judge. And I suppose, just depending on 3 where we are on a particular day, we can always fine 4 tune this. But an hour break for lunch around 11:45 5 Mountain time sounds just right. 6 THE COURT: Okay. So you kind of prefer to 7 take the lunch break at that point, which puts it a little earlier, rather than taking it a little later, 8 9 kind of in the 1:30 range here, which would be very 10 late for y'all, and would put us 1:30 to 2:30. You'd 11 prefer to do it about 11:45 here? 12 MR. MONDE: Judge, very slight preference. 13 Again, we're going to do what the Court would like us 14 And all else being equal, you know, I think 11:45 as a lunch break -- it's 1:45 east coast 15 16 time -- makes the most sense. But again, if we're in 17 the middle of an argument, and it just makes sense to 18 take a short break and continue through until later, 19 all the parties are going to be flexible on that, I'm 20 sure. So is that all right with you, 21 THE COURT: 22 Mr. Schlesinger? We'll just plan on the lunch break 23 coming at 11:45? No problem, Judge. 24 MR. SCHLESINGER: 25 THE COURT: Okay. We'll go with that.



All right. What's the next issue we need 1 2 to go to, Mr. Schlesinger? 3 MR. SCHLESINGER: I think that we need to 4 get a sense of how Your Honor would like to handle 5 the presentation of the class certification motion. I'm accustomed to arguing it with witnesses. 6 7 then I also know that some of the witnesses may be subject to Daubert challenges. And it's the 8 9 plaintiffs' position that that can all be done 10 together, so as not to have to bring witnesses twice. 11 And I think maybe Mr. Monde had some ideas of 12 staggering things where Daubert would precede some of the actual class certification. Plaintiff is pretty 13 14 strongly in favor of just going forward with the 15 class certification motion and dealing with the 16 Daubert as it comes, entrusting the Court to make the 17 decisions on which experts it accepts or excludes, 18 and then rule on the class certification based on the 19 evidence that the Court accepts as being supportive 20 of the class certification motion, or the evidence 21 that the Court accepts from the defendant in 22 opposition to the class certification motion. 23 And I would just point Your Honor to the 24 schedule that we're running along with this whole 25 entire time, we always agreed to -- and we pushed



back the dates -- but we've always -- it's a hearing on the motion for class certification and Daubert motions for five days. We always end up that way. It think that's the next issue, or the next matter that we need the Court's guidance on.

THE COURT: I'll hear from Mr. Monde in just a minute, but let me give you some thoughts.

The way, as a judge, I approach it, I think of the end product here.

I hope I have the number right. I think somebody said there was nine expert witnesses, and then we've got Daubert issues, we've got a class certification. So I'm thinking about what is the What is the product I've got to put out? And I need to get a sense as to what your expectations of me are and what you want my product to be. I guess I was thinking that probably y'all probably looked at some of my class action opinions, particularly in the ones that I have done in some of these oil and gas cases in Northern New Mexico. I'm trying to think of -- Anderson Living Trust, those cases that we've done up there. My memory, with some pretty experienced class counsel in those cases and pretty good defense counsel in those cases is that the product that I gave them wasn't separate opinions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	on their Daubert people. What I ended up doing was
2	doing a class certification opinion and largely in
3	the footnotes is I sorted through the evidence making
4	findings of fact, decided what evidence was
5	admissible and what wasn't, so that largely the
6	Daubert issues were resolved in maybe some lengthy
7	footnotes when it came time to decide whether that
8	witness was going to be admitted, or portions, which
9	is more likely the case, portions of the witness are
10	going to be admitted and some maybe aren't. So if
11	I'm thinking clearly, and I have a pretty good
12	visibility as to what the end product is going to be,
13	it would seem to me and I think I've done it both
14	ways but it would seem to me that it might be
15	better to just bring the people in, put the evidence
16	in and I'm not saying don't make the Daubert
17	arguments early. It seems to me that it might make
18	sense to have Daubert arguments first so that I'm
19	attuned to what to be listening for and watching for
20	as they testify. But I guess I'm not quite sure we
21	need to see them twice.
22	So I guess this is what and I'm thinking

So I guess this is what -- and I'm thinking out loud -- is that you come in, and let's spend some time with Daubert motions. If you want to bring the witness in at that point, that's fine. If you want





to just come in and make Daubert motions on -- the Daubert motions with the transcripts and those things, you make them then. And then, whenever we bring them in, let's just do them all at one time, that person; you put them on, we bring in all the I don't exclude anything on the basis of evidence. Daubert during the testimony. I take the testimony. And then, as I write the opinion, I make rulings on the Daubert. I think you will see -- I hope you will see that I have been disciplined enough not to just be, you know, the kind of judge you just bring in the dump truck and dump it in here, and I'm not going to be a judge and rule on the Daubert issues. rule on them. It's just a timing issue. And I don't think I'm going to be in good shape to rule during that week on the Daubert issues.

So I guess what I would propose is that we have a day or two at the beginning in which we may have Daubert arguments. If you want to bring in your witness at that point, fine. Let's just get all the testimony out of that expert done at that point. If you want to just have arguments at that point, that's fine, and then, when the witness comes in and testifies during the -- what I'll call the class certification part of the week, then we take all the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

testimony there including any questions that may be related to Daubert.

So let me go -- because if I heard what Mr. Schlesinger said, he thought that might be pretty good, but maybe not after I described it. Let me go to Mr. Monde first. Mr. Monde, what do you think about that sort of approach? You may be the one that's more reluctant on that one.

MR. MONDE: Well, Judge, we agree about hearing the Daubert arguments first. I'm going to pass the baton to my partner Meir Feder, who, as I said, will be taking the lead on that aspect of things, to flush out our position a little bit more.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Feder.

MR. FEDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

From the defendant's standpoint, I think there are two potential issues it's raising. One of them just about the amount of time available for the hearings in December, in total. Particularly if what we're talking about is, it sounds like, is hearings where we're going to be hearing from a number of witnesses with live testimony with eight Daubert motions, plus obviously a pretty involved class certification motion. I think that, if we're actually going to be trying to do that in five days,



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that we will end up giving short shrift to some things that may require more time. And so I just want to bracket that argument, or concern, as one thing to think about.

The second thing is that, at least as to a couple of the experts, we think that it would make a lot more sense to proceed first with those, and get some resolution on those, because they could either be dispositive as to class certification or at a minimum could clarify some issues for class certification.

There are two experts I have in mind in particular. The most obvious are plaintiffs' -- example is plaintiffs' damages expert, Dr. Dubay (phonetic). If his testimony were to be excluded, then the plaintiffs would have no basis for class-wide damages model, so that would be dispositive. That's sort of an example of the witness as to whom the Daubert ruling, you know, could save the need for other hearings.

The other one is Dr. Pearson, who is the plaintiffs' survey expert. And again, if she were to be excluded, that would create big obstacles for them. But even if you were to rule that her testimony was (unintelligible due to static) in part

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but not in whole, I think that could well affect the way some of the issues on class certification get argued. So that we get better presented to you in a way that doesn't have to account for sort of a series of contingencies as to what evidence might be coming in or not. So, you know, we do think that there would be a lot to be gained, at least as to those two motions, to have them addressed first (unintelligible due to static).

THE COURT: Mr. Feder. Mr. Feder, you're going to have to go back about a paragraph. You've got a lot of static on your phone, and you cut out on us. So go back about a paragraph and repeat that.

MR. FEDER: I apologize. I'm going to hypothesize that it's the headphone that I'm using and pull the headphone out and try talking straight into the phone. In any event -- I'm not sure where the static came in -- but I think that we have the issue of time overall, and the issue of sequencing, from sequencing the plaintiffs' damages expert, Dr. Dubay is an example of one where, if he were to be excluded, that would just be basically dispositive of class certification.

As to their survey expert, Dr. Pearson, I think, if she were to be excluded, it would be the



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

same thing. But if she were to be excluded in part, I think that, you know, depending on what Your Honor decided, that could change the complexion of what's argued on issues like commonality and predominance in ways that would allow the parties to speak much more directly to what you ultimately would have to decide than they could if it were being addressed, you know, on various contingencies, depending on whether she is -- her testimony is admitted in part, and which part, and so forth.

THE COURT: Well, let me make a couple observations, and then you may need to group with your attorneys and then put out a proposal. it's going to be real hard for me to have a five-day hearing, listen to Daubert issues on Monday and Tuesday; give you a ruling, and then that impact the rest of the week. I don't think, knowing myself, that's going to be realistic. You're not going to get a ruling that week probably on these Daubert So if you think that's going to shortcut issues. stuff to put on Daubert issues first on Monday and Tuesday; get a quick ruling from me, and that eliminate the case, I don't think that's going to happen. So if that is helpful to you, then you may want to rethink what you're requesting. Because I



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

don't think that's going to happen. You're probably going to put on a week's worth of work, and we just need to brace ourselves for it, get it done, and I'll sort it out when I write the opinion.

If you're telling me that everybody would love to get together earlier and have a day or two in which we hear some critical witnesses, and then we pause and I write an opinion on Daubert issues on a couple of witnesses, then we can talk about that.

But given what I just said what's your thoughts, Mr. Feder?

MR. FEDER: My thought is that, obviously, we are going to present our side of the case in whatever time the Court has available. I think that when the schedule was set, I'm not sure that we knew that there were going to be eight Daubert motions to address. I think that if we attempt to address them all in part -- forgetting about ruling on them -- I think to address them all in part of a week is probably going to end up -- particularly if Mr. Schlesinger is contemplating testimony, as it sounds like he may be -- I think it's going to be awfully tight and result in not necessarily being able to do justice to all of these eight motions.

THE COURT: Well, let me go back to you,



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Schlesinger. I made a new comments before we really fleshed out the plaintiffs' position. Given my comments, given what -- I mean, if you need more time, we'll find more time. I mean, I don't want to shortchange you on time. So, you know, I'm not saying five days and that's it; you've got to put on Daubert motions and a class certification in five days. So I can work with you on flexibility on time. I can work with you on -- if you want to do Daubert motions that week, and then you tell me, Judge, go write an opinion on it and give us your opinion on Daubert motions, we'll come back and do the class certification.

The one caveat I'd just throw out there is sometimes people think Daubert motions are decided in a vacuum, and it's like summary judgment motions, like a vacuum. And sometimes it's not. I mean, sometimes we are killing ourselves, I think, in a Daubert hearing over this testimony. And a lot of times, when we really get to the testimony, either at trial or the class certification or whatever, you know, we just need a bit of it here, a bit of it there. And you don't need to wipe out the whole expert.

So I'll do it any way y'all want to, if



y'all can agree. But sometimes I think Daubert motions sometimes are better thought out and better decided in a real world context, rather than sometimes the hypothetical, theoretical feeling that a Daubert issue has.

But, anyway, let me hear from you, Mr. Schlesinger. I've been talking probably too much.

Not at all, Judge. MR. SCHLESINGER: good to get the Court's hint. And if it please the Court, what you first said your preference was sounded exactly like the way I think it should go. I want to remind the Court that forever the scheduling order has always contemplated a hearing on a motion for class certification. And I don't want the tail wagging the dog on behalf of the plaintiff, with the Court's indulgence, by making the Daubert motions predominant. Because they are not. I have to disagree with my learned opposing counsel, none of the two experts that he has a Daubert motion pending against me -- he's only got two against me --Ms. Pearson and my damages expert. Neither one of them are dispositive. And much as you said, there are bits and pieces that when you hear all the testimony, you may pick and choose some of it as being satisfactory to the Court and some is not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You said the end product is going to be a ruling on class certification interspersed with whatever decisions Your Honor makes with regard to the validity of the experts' evidence. So that you'll only include that evidence that you accepted.

So what we should be doing, because we have the burden of proof -- and we don't need more than five days, and we don't need any preliminary hearing. I think Your Honor will find that we're going to be completely done with all the briefing the better part of a month ahead of this. We've already submitted our Daubert motions. More importantly, the defendant has already submitted their Daubert motions. So you'll have a familiarity with what it is that they find or that they suggest is lacking in our witnesses' position. So Your Honor is going to come into the hearing with some knowledge about that.

You're also going to see all of our experts' report, the depositions, are taken. We're going to try to make the presentation that adds color to what's already in the amount of paperwork that Your Honor will probably have digested substantially before you ever hear us argue it.

I'm happy to split the time that we use evenly with Mr. Monde. We can work out the schedule



of how we present things to Your Honor. But if I had my druthers, what you first said about how you'd like to go about doing it would work for me on behalf of the plaintiffs, and that is Monday morning we can begin our presentations. If there are any preliminary matters to take up, we can give an opening overview of what we intend to present and what our principal arguments are in favor of class certification. Mr. Monde and his team can give an opening to lay out how they oppose it. And then we're going to present evidence, whether it's experts, the video depositions of all the experts that have already been deposed and put on video, or witnesses on the videoconference live to flush out their opinions or perhaps focus on the key points of their opinion. I think that that's how we, as the plaintiff, would much prefer to do it. And it's also the stipulation that we've made with opposing counsel, now going back for quite some time, because the scheduling order, the order extending certain deadlines, is just a reiteration of different dates on a motion for a hearing on a motion for class certification. So it doesn't say hearing on motions for Daubert or dispose of Daubert first.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



I've looked at the law, and I see how Your

Honor approaches it. I don't want the Daubert tail
wagging the dog. And I would say, just as one point
of you know, of consideration, that the two
witnesses who we are there is one witness they
moved for Daubert that's a rebuttal, so that's not a
moment. Ms. Pearson is backed up by other witnesses
with similar testimony to hers, and she has
impeccable credentials, if I may say so, and I think
Your Honor will see that her work product meets all
the minimum and maximum requirements of Daubert even
on the papers. And our economist, even though we
have other damages beside economic damages, that's
injunctive relief, so the economist is no way
dispositive. But Mr. Dubay is also impeccably
credentialed. We'd like to present at least some of
his testimony live to you. I think that on the
papers, Your Honor may already be somewhat persuaded
these are satisfactory to give you evidence. So
you'll have an idea before we ever have the hearing.
I suppose if one of our witnesses looks,
you know, shaky based on Mr. Monde's arguments
against him, and Your Honor can express that to us,
and say: I have a concern. Are you ready to shore
this guy or this lady up, when you put him or her on
the witness stand?

PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTING SERVICE

1	But in terms of what we want, we want to go
2	forward with the class certification Monday morning.
3	We want to start just like a regular trial, treat it
4	like a trial, the evidentiary, and let Your Honor
5	decide how you want to write it up, and you can
6	let you edit out those witnesses who don't pass
7	muster under the Daubert. But that should be
8	derivative to the actual class cert hearing. That's
9	the plaintiffs' position, please the Court.
10	THE COURT: Well, let me tweak that a
11	little bit. I guess I'm thinking that maybe we take
12	a little bit of Monday, I guess that's what I'm
13	thinking Mr. Feder may say that's not going to be
14	enough, and then we'll have to figure out but some
15	of Monday, and let him make a presentation on his
16	Daubert argument so that my antennas go up and I'm a
17	more intelligent listener and watcher during the

MR. SCHLESINGER: You know, I'm used to -one of the things I'm used to -- and Mr. Monde will
attest -- is with some of the tobacco defendants we
routinely deal with, they usually have some pretrial
matters they want to take up. And unlike a lot of

If I was inclined to go a little bit that

approach, how would you tweak, Mr. Schlesinger, your

proposal of how to deal with the week?



18

19

20

21

22

23

24

trials I've done over the years, the pretrial matters with "industry" are often a bit involved. So if we wanted to earmark the morning for defense counsel to lay out their Daubert concerns, you know, so that we could have a back and forth about that; we could hear from Your Honor whatever preliminarily you discern from the materials you've already had available on Daubert to consider; we'll respond in the morning, and then maybe by after the lunch hour we can launch into an opening statement and start presenting witnesses. We're happy to do that.

The alternative, I guess, would be to just start as I originally suggested with opening statements, and they can lay out in their opening statement their position as to Daubert. But if Your Honor is of a mind to let them fuss about Daubert in the morning on Monday, I would accommodate that.

THE COURT: Well, what do you think about that, Mr. Feder: Give you from 8:30 to 11:45 on Monday morning, and you give me your Daubert argument so my antennas are up and I can be a good listener and watcher. Then that gives us four-and-a-half days to get through the class certification. What do you think about that?

MR. FEDER: You know, I'd like to confer



with my colleagues. I think that that sounds at least like it has the markings of a reasonable compromise. I do think that, you know, I liked what you said earlier about, you know, perhaps starting with the Dauberts and seeing how much time that takes, and then getting to class certification subsequent to that without, you know, necessarily bifurcating the hearing.

I think, like Mr. Schlesinger, and I think one of their biggest concerns is not letting the Daubert become the tail that wags the dog, because as you'll see in our papers, most of our class cert opposition is based on things that have nothing to do with the expert witnesses. And so, you know, we want to make sure that whatever focus goes to the Daubert and the expert witnesses does not end up either foreshortening or interfering with the class cert argument. So, you know, that's the primary thing that we want to have coming out of this. And, you know, so what you're suggesting sounds reasonable to me, subject to my being told by my colleagues that there is something I'm not thinking of that would be problematic about it.

THE COURT: Well, let's do this: I like to kind of leave one of these status conferences as firm

PROFESSIONAL COURT

REPORTING SERVICE



So let's plan on it. So we'll give you 1 as I can. 2 the morning to argue your two motions, and you've got 3 that time to argue those. And we'll plan on right 4 after lunch starting with Mr. Schlesinger doing the opening statement he set on class certification. 5 6 you and Mr. Schlesinger want to tweak that, I'm game. 7 Probably whatever y'all come up with is going to be fine with me. If you can't agree, what I just 8 outlined will be the default position, and that's how 9 10 we'll start out on Monday morning, and then we'll go 11 from there. I think the --12 MR. FEDER: Your Honor --THE COURT: 13 I think the backstop is that if 14 we get to the end of the week and we need more time, you know, if the defendants feel squeezed about their 15 16 Daubert stuff, I can find some more time to come 17 back, and they can make more of their Daubert 18 presentation. But probably the train is going to 19 leave and everything is coming in and I'm going to 20 sort it out largely in the writing of the opinion. 21 Somebody was trying to speak. Who was I 22 cutting off? 23 MR. FEDER: I apologize, Your Honor. 24 I just wanted to mention that one thing Feder again. 25 that does raise is that a number of Daubert motions

1 that plaintiffs have filed don't really go to class 2 certification issues. And so, if what you're 3 contemplating is sort of an early focus on the couple 4 that do, and then class certification, I'm not sure 5 that it's entirely clear how some of those other Daubert motions will end up fitting in, and, you 6 7 know, whether to contemplate any division between constant on class certification and constant on some 8 of these Daubert, that really just go to summary 9 10 judgment or trial. 11 THE COURT: Well, I think what you're 12

wanting is you're wanting to get your Daubert motions argued. It sounds like Mr. Schlesinger doesn't really care exactly when his Daubert issues get argued. He's not as concerned about it. He wants to get to the class certification. So I'm trying to give you a little bit of time to argue your Daubert. He seems less interested in arguing those at the first. He'll figure out how to do them either in the class certification or we'll pick another time and argue them. Am I reading you right, Mr. Schlesinger?

MR. SCHLESINGER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. So we'll structure it this way. I'm trying to get the things that are important to you at the beginning. And we'll, as the



13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



week goes on, we'll either get them done or we'll have to regroup on smaller issues at a later point.

All right. Mr. Schlesinger, what is the next issue or topic we need to discuss?

Let's see, I have -- let MR. SCHLESINGER: me just look at my notes here. No, sir. The only thing I would say, and I take this up conferred with my co-counsel today is, you know -- and of course, I would do it, you know, by agreement if need be with Mr. Monde -- if we want to preserve any testimony of a witness that we present during the class certification hearing, I'd like the Court's blessing to present a witness by so-called preserved trial testimony between now and the hearing. And I'm only saying that because it occurs to me that a witness that we might want to have appear live in that December timeframe might be traveling or on holiday or not available. And in the event I find that out in the next few days, I may want to set up a video deposition for preservation to present in support of class cert on a witness that I either can't otherwise bring live or it would just be more convenient to just get that the witness in the can so that I can present all or part of it to the Court as if they were attending the actual class certification



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

hearing. In the Court permits me to do that, I'll set that up, and of course I'll clear the dates and everything with Mr. Monde.

THE COURT: How do you feel about that, Mr. Monde?

MR. MONDE: Well, Judge, let me just back up half a step. It does sound like the two sides need to agree on a schedule to share information about who they intend to actually call as witnesses at the hearing, so that we can prepare for those that are coming and not waste time preparing for witnesses that the other side has no intent of calling. So I would say that, number one.

Number two, if either side has a witness who is simply not available those five days in December because of business or personal reasons, I expect the two sides will work with each other to accommodate that, and in that limited instance agree on alternatives such as preserving the testimony. I heard Mr. Schlesinger at one point extend that to just as matters of convenience. And that to me would -- just falls on the other side of the line. You know, we're preparing for this hearing, and the hearing has long been scheduled from December 14th to the 18th, and so we have long expected that if there



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are going to be witnesses called that that's when we would need to do our cross-examinations, and vice versa. And on top of all that, Mr. Schlesinger spoke in a bit of a hypothetical.

So the parties will confer and agree on a date by which we will exchange information about who we intend to have present, number one. And then number two, if Mr. Schlesinger has a particular witness with a business related, personal related scheduling issue as opposed to just mere convenience, then we will work with him to get that preserved.

THE COURT: Will, let me say this: y'all agree on anything, it will be fine with me. Ιf you don't agree -- somebody can correct me if I'm wrong -- discovery on class certification is over. And so if you don't agree, the default position is discovery is over. And I don't know -- whether you're preserving it for trial or whatever, it's But, you know, it's up to y'all. I know these over. are important to everybody, so whatever y'all want to But, you know, you probably have a deposition of these people. You've got reports of these people. You know, I think you probably have all the tools to present it. Even if you don't have a video or something that you can show me, I can read.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to dazzle me, you can put it on the screen and scroll 1 2 it and highlight and all that sort of stuff for me, 3 like -- I did that in the old days, like 2003. 4 you know, I think there are ways to do it. But if 5 you can't agree, I'm probably not going to reopen 6 discovery so I force one side or the other to do a 7 deposition to preserve discovery or preserve a deposition. 8 9 MR. SCHLESINGER: Your Honor, that's fine. 10 If I can't work something like that out with Mr. 11 Monde, and I don't expect it's going to be an issue. 12 Don't give it a second thought, Judge. 13 THE COURT: Okay. All right. What's the 14 next issue that we need to discuss, Mr. Schlesinger? MR. SCHLESINGER: For the plaintiffs, Your 15 16 Honor, I think -- let me look at my notes here real quick. 17 I think that's it. 18 THE COURT: All right. I don't want to 19 undercut you, you're lead attorney for the 20 plaintiffs, but do you mind if I ask any of your 21 co-counsel if they have any other issues they want to 22 bring up, since we're having to do this by phone? 23 MR. SCHLESINGER: Oh, not at all. 24 I'm sure that Ms. Weiner has some thoughts as well, 25 and she's on the phone. So absolutely, Judge.



THE COURT: Ms. Weiner, do you want to bring up any topics for us to discuss before I go to the defendants?

MS. WEINER: Judge, no, other than just kind of some logistical questions in terms of when the Court would like us to present it, either with our agreement on a schedule -- you know, if we should confer with Mr. Monde and his colleagues regarding the point that he raised on alerting the others who we intend to call so that we can adequately prepare; just kind of -- whether the Court would like to set that schedule now, or if we should meet and confer, work together, and submit something to the Court in terms of how we plan to handle that schedule?

THE COURT: Do you have a thought on that,

THE COURT: Do you have a thought on that, Mr. Monde?

MR. MONDE: Let's meet and confer. And if we have an issue, Judge, we'll get back in touch with Juan and set a short call if needed.

THE COURT: Let me just tell me how I'm going to probably prepare for this hearing. At some point Juan is going to go into a massive copying job on this. And if it looks like it fits in a chair, I probably am going to drag my feet and continue to work on other stuff, since I've got one crisis after



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
another before the end of November. If, on the other
 1
 2
     hand, he fills the entire conference table, I may
 3
     start freaking out and start reading it now.
                                                    So the
 4
     reason I say that is because -- don't worry about my
 5
     schedule right now, because I don't really have a
 6
     sense as to the volume of material I'm going to have
 7
               I just don't have a sense. Y'all probably
     do. And if it's a lot, and Mr. Gonzales starts
 8
     copying things, then I'll probably begin to get a
 9
10
     feel for it. So take your time. And, you know, I'm
11
     not in a hurry to see how you're structuring this
12
            I'm more worried about figuring out when I'm
13
     going to begin to read these things, given what I've
14
     got to do between now and the end of November.
15
     And --
16
               MR. SCHLESINGER:
                                 I think there is already
17
     plenty, Judge. I'm certain we've already submitted
18
     plenty of reading material.
19
               THE COURT:
                           I figured that. So don't worry
20
     about it, Ms. Weiner; just go ahead and meet with Mr.
21
     Monde. I'm sure, when you get it to me, it will be
22
     just fine.
23
               What else do you have, Ms. Weiner?
24
               MS. WEINER: That's all I have, Judge.
25
     Thank you.
```



THE COURT: Anybody else on the plaintiffs' 1 2 side that feels like there is some topic that needs to be raised before I go to the defendants? 3 4 All right. Mr. Monde, Mr. Feder, what 5 issues would you like to bring up for discussion? 6 MR. MONDE: Meir, do you have anything 7 else? 8 I don't. MR. FEDER: 9 MR. MONDE: Judge, I would just say in 10 fairness in response to your question, there is a 11 significant volume of material. What does that mean? It probably exceeds the bounds of one chair, for 12 13 I say that not to worry the Court, or 14 certainly not to ask the Court to start reading early. I say it only to make this point: 15 That we 16 will proceed as the Court has outlined in terms of 17 getting a hearing on the two Dauberts that we have 18 brought that do relate to class certification. 19 don't know whether a half day is going to be 20 sufficient or not. I think, once the Court sees the 21 papers on those two witnesses, the Court -- and 22 that's again Dr. Dubay and Dr. Pearson -- I think the 23 Court will appreciate that it is difficult to give a 24 firm estimate of how much time would be required. 25 But more importantly to your point, these

are very important issues to us. The Court has 1 2 always been willing to hear us out, within reason of 3 course, both sides. And we simply ask for that here. 4 And the scheduling order, in fact, calls for hearing 5 on both class certification and the Daubert motions. 6 So hearings on the Daubert motions have, in fact, been part of scheduling order from the beginning; not 7 just a hearing on class certification. We understand 8 9 the Court wants to consider those together. We'll do 10 that. But I just want to make the point that we 11 would like the opportunity to present on these two 12 Dauberts at the outset, as the Court has allowed, 13 without feeling that we are on a very tight clock, 14 such that at 11:45 we can't argue anything more on 15 those two motions. Well, if you can wrangle more 16 THE COURT: 17 time from Mr. Schlesinger, that's fine with me. 18 if you can't, then you're going to have to be on the 19

if you can't, then you're going to have to be on the clock. You'll just have to organize your presentations. Because unless Mr. Schlesinger is willing to slide a little bit on Monday and give you a little more time, we'll probably start -- not probably -- we will start the openings on class certifications at 12:45. But if y'all agree to something else, then fine. You'll just have to make



20

21

22

23

24

a compressed one, and we'll either have to circle back and do it at the end of the week or another day or we'll have to figure out some other way to give you a full opportunity to make the arguments that you want.

MR. MONDE: Well -- and that helps, Judge. In other words, what I hear you saying is that you want us to wrap up our presentation on those two experts for the time being or suspend it at 11:45. And then, if we feel we need additional time, the Court is willing to hear us at some point.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's your backstop is I'm not going to say that's it, 11:45, I never want to hear these motions again. I'll double back at the end of the week, if we have some extra time or set up another time. And I'm also willing, if y'all want to throw this into your discussions, if y'all want to try to find some time before this to maybe have a day or two days on Daubert motions, or something like that, I'll try to find some time between now and the time in December -- that's two months away -- to find you some more time. And if y'all want to do that, I'll give it to you, and we'll give you two days. And that way Mr. Schlesinger can come in here at 8:30 on Monday morning and get



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

started with his class certification. And we can 1 2 take a day or two days, whatever you think you need, 3 on Daubert issues, and maybe we can take some of Mr. 4 Schlesinger's motions as well. I don't really know 5 what those are as much, but -- so that's a possibility, too. And if y'all discuss and think 6 7 that's something worth asking for or pursuing, I'm 8 game. 9 MR. MONDE: Thank you, Judge. 10 discuss that. 11 THE COURT: Okay. What else, Mr. Monde, 12 Mr. Feder, Mr. Schultz? Y'all have any other issues, 13 topics you want to raise, need some quidance on 14 today? 15 MR. MONDE: I don't think anything further 16 from us, Judge. 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is there 18 anything else we need to discuss while we're 19 together? Anything else I can do for you, Mr. 20 Schlesinger? 21 Stay healthy in New MR. SCHLESINGER: 22 Mexico, Judge. We've been through what you're going 23 through now in New Mexico, we've been through in 24 August here in Florida. And we just hunker down and 25 stay healthy.



1	THE COURT: You know, after I lost my wife
2	last year, after she passed away, I don't have much
3	family out here. So if the Governor doesn't let me
4	go to Texas, I don't get to see anybody. And I can't
5	go to New York. We're such a hot spot. My boys live
6	up in Brooklyn. I can't get up there without
7	quarantining when I get up there, so I don't really
8	want to go to New York and quarantine. So I'm ready
9	to see some people is what I would like to do. But
10	it doesn't look like it's going to happen for a
11	while.
12	MR. MONDE: You're not alone, Judge. I
13	think we have a raging consensus on that, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr.
15	Schlesinger?
16	MR. SCHLESINGER: Judge, you know, I
17	remember we had heard that you had lost your wife.
18	And I don't know that we've ever spoken and were able
19	to express our condolences, but everybody involved in
20	this litigation would do that, and I will do that
21	right now, if we haven't done it before. I heard
22	from Randi McGinn you had. And I would like to
23	express my condolences.
24	THE COURT: I appreciate that. Yeah, Randi
25	lost her husband, Charlie Daniels, here a little bit



after that. Well, Saturday was the 18-month 1 2 anniversary. And Judge Parker here, who lost his 3 wife a few years ago, told me that the 18 months is 4 the hardest, was one of the hardest times for him. 5 I've talked to counselors and other people. Sunday, I just took the day off and got in the car. 6 7 And my wife and I used to always go to Northern New Mexico, so we used to try to go up to Northern New 8 9 Mexico and see the trees about this time. 10 recreated our last few years' trip up there. 11 didn't stop and eat. I didn't think I wanted to eat 12 But I did stop and see a lot of trees, and 13 pester the family with a lot of pictures and stuff 14 like that. So it was a good weekend. I miss her 15 greatly. But it was a good weekend. 16 How about you, Mr. Monde? Anything else we 17 need to discuss while we're together? Anything else 18 I can do for you today? 19 MR. MONDE: Nothing, Judge, except of 20 course, we join in Mr. Schlesinger's thoughts. And 21 I'll close where you opened, that if we can all just 22 learn a bit more compassion from this very 23 challenging time that we're going through, we will 24 come out better for it. 25 THE COURT: Yeah, I went out to Placitas --



the local guys will know where that is -- but my wife's brother and his wife live out there. They're both from Hobbs. We all grew up together down in Hobbs together. And it was kind of interesting. I don't know if it's a combination of him losing his sister and -- or just the pandemic, but they told me that they're probably going to leave the state. had spent 30 days this summer in Colorado at Fort They had a dog that needed some chemo, and Collins. you can't get chemo for a dog in New Mexico. That's stretching our poor state's limits. So they went to Colorado Springs, which has the veterinarian school. And they were up there in their RV for 30 days. they just fell in love with Fort Collins. their son lives with his partner in Denver, and her husband, and they're in Denver. And I think they're just moving up there. So interesting times. I think whether you lose a wife or whether you just live through the pandemic, or a combination of it, I don't think we're ever going to be quite the same. going to make changes with our lives and do things a little different. Well, listen, y'all be safe. Call Mr. Gonzales if we can do anything for you. And if y'all

get off the phone and agree to something else, want

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	to go a different direction, let me know. But we
2	stand ready to serve y'all. I was telling my law
3	clerk got new law clerks here that I'm introducing
4	to this case I said: This was a great idea to be
5	an MDL judge about three years ago. Now that the
6	work is here, I wonder how great it is. But we'll
7	have fun together. We'll remember this when we're
8	old and sitting on rocking chairs out in front.
9	Y'all be safe. Call us and let us know how
10	we can help.
11	(The Court stood in recess.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	





1	C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E
2	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
4	DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO
5	
6	
7	I, Jennifer Bean, FAPR, RDR, CRR, RMR, CCR,
8	Official Court Reporter for the State of New Mexico,
9	do hereby certify that the foregoing pages constitute
10	a true transcript of proceedings had before the said
11	Court, held in the District of New Mexico, in the
12	matter therein stated.
13	In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my
14	hand on November 5, 2020.
15	
16	
17	
18	Jennifer Bean, FAPR, RMR-RDR-CCR
19	Certified Realtime Reporter United States Court Reporter
20	NM CCR #94 333 Lomas, Northwest
21	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102 Phone: (505) 348-2283
22	Fax: (505) 843-9492
23	
24	
25	



